C·I·C

**The Book as the Gold Standard
for Tenure and Promotion
in the Humanistic Disciplines**

Leigh Estabrook
With Bijan Warner, Research Assistant

Table of contents

The Book as the Gold Standard for Tenure and Promotion in the Humanistic Disciplines
Leigh Estabrook
With Bijan Warner, Research Assistant[1]

Summary of Findings

With funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation conducted a study (June-November, 2003) to determine the extent to which publication of a scholarly monograph is essential for faculty to receive tenure in the humanistic disciplines. Further, it sought to understand whether faculty members and their department chairs are open to change of their promotion and tenure standards. The research was carried out by the Library Research Center at the University of Illinois and directed by Leigh Estabrook. It included surveys and focus groups of faculty in Anthropology, History and English at CIC institutions; telephone interviews of department chairs in six of the CIC universities; and a survey of faculty who left before receiving tenure in these departments. Among the major findings are the following:

- With the exception of scholars who are doing "creative work" or whose work is in certain subfields of Anthropology, department chairs expect a faculty member to have published (or have in press) a scholarly monograph prior to consideration for tenure.

- Department chairs are not willing to abandon the scholarly monograph as a standard for promotion and tenure.

- Only in History departments does a majority of faculty believe a book should be required (with rare exceptions) for tenure in their departments. Faculty with tenure and faculty who have not yet achieved tenure are similar in their views about this issue.

- Most of the faculty members surveyed do not feel a book length manuscript is necessary to present their scholarship.

- Department chairs and junior faculty have different perceptions about the type of support provided by the department to untenured faculty.

- The publication record of faculty achieving tenure has increased since the 1970s, suggesting that requirements for promotion and tenure in CIC schools have increased.

- Nearly one-fourth (24.5 percent) of the faculty report being asked for a subvention for one or more books. Respondents differ in their perspectives about subventions with some quite accepting of the practice and others concerned about the implications of providing subventions.

- Junior faculty have numerous concerns about the process of getting their work in print, including issues of market forces, time between submission and response and the changing profile of presses.

- Faculty members are beginning to examine electronic publications as an outlet for scholarship. A small number of departments have formally considered how electronic publications should be evaluated.

An analysis of these findings is contained in the full report to be distributed prior to the December 2, 2003 meeting of CIC provosts and LAS deans.

---

[1] Leigh Estabrook is Professor of Library and Information Science and of Sociology at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. She directs the Library Research Center. Bijan Warner recently received his B.A. in English from the University of Illinois.

The Book as the Gold Standard for Tenure and Promotion in the Humanistic Disciplines: Findings and Analyses

      The following report provides background for the planned December 2, 2003 Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) Summit on Scholarly Communication in the Humanities and Social Sciences. With generous support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the CIC conducted a study (June-November, 2003) to determine the extent to which publication of a scholarly monograph is essential for faculty to receive tenure in the humanistic disciplines. Further, it sought to understand whether faculty members and their department chairs are open to change of their promotion and tenure standards. The research was carried out by the Library Research Center at the University of Illinois and directed by Leigh Estabrook.

      The research involved a web-based survey (with paper mail follow-up) to all tenured and tenure track faculty members in History, English and Anthropology in CIC institutions for which we had valid electronic or postal mail addresses.[2] A total of 864 surveys were sent, with 456 returned for a response rate of 52.8 percent. Supplementing that survey are data derived from (i) a review of promotion and tenure guidelines; (ii) a web-based questionnaire to 55 faculty who, in the past five years, left these institutions prior to receiving tenure;[3] (iii) focus-group interviews with junior faculty at the Northwestern University, the University of Iowa, and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; (iv) telephone interviews with a seventeen department heads from six CIC institutions.[4][5] The variety of data provide a rich resource for understanding the role of the scholarly monograph in promotion and tenure decisions in three disciplines represented in CIC university. They cannot tell us about American universities in general, nor even about other humanistic disciplines at CIC institutions.

      The investigators sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is it the case that the book is required for promotion with indefinite tenure in these three disciplines? Are there exceptions? Do faculty members from different ranks have different perspectives about whether it should be required?
2. How willing are department heads and faculty to change criteria for promotion and tenure away from "the book as gold standard"?
3. Is there evidence that requirements for tenure have increased in these departments in the past 20 years?
4. What issues in scholarly publication are most problematic for faculty?
5. How willing are department heads and faculty to consider alternative forms of publication?

---

[2] The University of Chicago declined to participate in the study.

[3] CIC departments provided names and possible contact information. We were able to track 55 of the faculty names provided to the research team and received completed surveys from 33 for a response rate of 60%.

[4] From Indiana University, Michigan State, Penn State University, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, and University of Illinois at Chicago.

[5] A full description of the study's methods has been developed as a separate document.

Findings:[6]

- *With the exception of scholars who are doing "creative work" or whose work is in certain subfields of Anthropology, department chairs expect a faculty member to have published (or have in press) a scholarly monograph prior to consideration for tenure.*

Our study shows the promotion and tenure documents of CIC schools to be similar to those surveyed by Cronin and La Barre.[7] The majority of CIC promotion and tenure documents do not specifically state that a faculty member must have a book to achieve promotion with tenure. The English Department guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure at Purdue University, for example, state:

> "The normal expectation for promotion to associate professor with tenure…is either a book—accepted and in press with a reputable academic publisher—or a significant number of substantial publications in refereed journals and/or chapters in refereed collections…Publication may be either in traditional print form or in electronic or on-line forms."[8]

The notion that a significant body of publications might be substituted for a book is mentioned in the P&T documents of other departments and schools. Our interviews with chairs of History, English and Anthropology departments provide strong evidence, however, that faculty members (with the exception of faculty doing creative works or in archaeology, linguistics and biological Anthropology) must produce a book to achieve tenure. The seventeen chairs interviewed—even those who saw themselves as more open to the possibilities of presenting faculty scholarship in alternative ways—were consistent in expressing their expectation that faculty will have at least one scholarly monograph as part of his or her portfolio for promotion and tenure. The P&T documents of the History department, unlike the English department, at Purdue University reflect this common sentiment of department chairs: "Of utmost importance is an excellent **scholarly monograph,** well written, persuasively argued, based on appropriate primary sources, engaging appropriate historiography, and published by a reputable academic press" (author's emphasis).

Chairs sometimes lamented the insistence on a book for tenure, noting that the key question is the quality of the faculty member's work and how much impact it has on the field. But in those areas in which the book has been expected in the past, there seems little indication that that expectation will change. One English department chair said he "can't point to any substantive data that our people have failed to find publishers." Another from an Anthropology department said her department members are "trying to maintain a steady expectation of quantity and not up that. Having second book in the works is pretty standard."

---

[6] For those interested in more data:

Survey of faculty who left
A summary of frequencies for this questionnaire may be found at http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/99EZJ2/99EZJ2_0001.html
A summary of open ended comments may be found at http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/2V7GP4/2V7GP4_0001.html

Survey of current CIC faculty
A summary of frequencies may be found at http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/V5H3JW/V5H3JW_0001.html

A summary of comments to open ended questions may be found at http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/33E9AU/33E9AU_0001.html

[7] Cronin, Blaise and Kathryn La Barre. "Mickey Mouse and Milton: Book Publishing in the Humanities." *Learned Publishing,* vol. 17(January, 2004). Available prior to publication at: http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~klabarre/Humanities.doc

[8] The English department at Purdue is rare in that it has a statement on the evaluation of electronic publishing in its P&T documents: "Publication may be either in traditional print form or in electronic or on-line forms." Although rare in P&T documents, this kind of statement on the evaluation of electronic publishing should not be confused for open acceptance and enthusiasm. Nowhere in the P&T documents are explicit details to be found on how electronic publishing will be evaluated and what kind of documents will be considered; this is to be expected as scholars are still exploring ways to utilize electronic venues. Furthermore, as interviewed chairs corroborate, traditional print is always preferred and it is very risky for tenure-track faculty to depend on electronically published articles.

At the same time some department chairs recognize a more fluid understanding of what a book is. One noted: "The profession and this department…are being dragged kicking and screaming into broader definitions of scholarship." Chairs mentioned a willingness to accept more creative materials, including film and varied forms of written expression. For example, a department chair in English noted "you'd find a broadening of interest in some variety of creative, expressive and interpretive material. Foregrounding of personal experience in much of the work people do. [The] memoir has become high prestige area…advanc[ing our] understanding…." Another chair noted changes in attitudes toward editions of works. He said he is "…trying to explain to dean there are new editorial principles. Convention used to be that editor did not seek to interpret the work by editing the work—editor was rendering a perfect text—edition then available for critics to interpret. New editorial principles argue that every edition is interpretation. That blurs the distinction between editions and monographs."

Department chairs, when asked how they mentor junior faculty, appeared confident that they were providing, guidance, feedback and support. And some appeared annoyed at the behavior of junior faculty who appeared to demand quantifiable measures of achievement. However, in the focus group discussions it was apparent that junior faculty are not getting the guidance they want and probably need. At one institution we asked, "tell me how you chose (the publishers to which you sent your manuscript), what guidance you have on that, what kind of contact has been." The faculty members proceeded to discuss in detail issues such as how they have worked with different publishers, the value of going to meetings of the professional associations and contacting publishers, and to whom to send a manuscript (and how much of the manuscript to send). This occurred at every institution and revealed a hunger from non-tenured faculty to understand better the way they should work with different publishers.

- *Department chairs are not willing to abandon the scholarly monograph as a standard for promotion and tenure.*

The more fluid understanding of what a book is, as mentioned above, does not translate into a willingness to abandon the scholarly monograph as the norm for promotion and tenure. When asked whether it was likely that their departments would alter expectations with regard to all levels of publishing, chairs' responses were mixed. No one said that they expected to ask for fewer publications; but several talked about wanting to get away from a "numbers game" to focus more on the impact and quality of publications. Individuals at Michigan State University, Penn State and Illinois Chicago echoed one department chair's comment that at his university "people are trying to raise the bar; [it is] not necessarily a bad thing." Chairs also compared themselves to other universities. One historian said, "No one can step out in front without paying attention to other schools [we] compare ourselves to." Another said, "My initial reaction to Greenblatt's letter was, when they decide to change the requirements at Harvard you can come talk to the rest of us."[9]

And while our interviews reveal high value attached to the scholarly monograph, several department chairs expressed concern about the corruption of the process of faculty evaluation. Two of the individuals mentioned Lindsay Waters'[10] (Executive Editor for the Humanities at Harvard University Press) point that university presses have become surrogates for other kinds of peer review. "…part of the issue involves foisting off the decision about the quality of work to the University presses. Evaluation in the home department is less intensive" said one chair of an English department. If this is so, then a comment from another respondent is particularly troubling:

---

[9] Greenblatt, S. (2002). Call for action on problems in scholarly book publishing; a special letter from Stephen Greenblatt. Available at: http://chronicle.com/jobs/2002/07/2002070202c.htm

[10] Waters, Lindsay. "Rescue Tenure From the Tyranny of the Monograph," *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* April 20, 2001: B7. Available at: http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v47/i32/32b00701.htm

It is always difficult to get reliable feedback from reviewers. Probably one-third of reviewers take the job seriously (it's very difficult, so that's one reason why, but it's also not rewarded to the degree that it should be, both monetarily and professionally). I'm seeing this both as an author and as an editor of a book series (and now, as a publisher).

- *Only in History departments do most faculty believe a book should be required (with rare exceptions) for tenure in their departments. Faculty with tenure and faculty who have not yet achieved tenure are similar in their views about this issue.*

Faculty members are less adamant about the book as a gold standard for promotion and tenure. Of the three faculty groups we studied, only historians insist on the scholarly monograph as an essential piece of a faculty member's promotion and tenure portfolio. The survey to all CIC faculty asked, "Do you believe that a book (under contract or published) should be required for tenure in your department?" Over 80 percent (82.9 percent; N=136) of the historians replied "yes" or "yes, with rare exceptions." Fewer than half (46.6 percent; N=90) of English department faculty and only 17.9 percent (N=17) of anthropologists gave similar responses. (Table 1)

Table 1

| | | | (8) Do you believe that a book (under contract or published) should be required for tenure in your department? | | | | |
			1 Yes	2 Yes, with rare exception	3 Not for certain subfields	4 No	Total
(15) Your department:	1 History	Count	71	65	17	11	164
		% within (15)	43.3%	39.6%	10.4%	6.7%	100.0%
		% within (8)	62.8%	50.0%	16.0%	10.6%	36.2%
	2 English	Count	32	58	45	59	194
		% within (15)	16.5%	29.9%	23.2%	30.4%	100.0%
		% within (8)	28.3%	44.6%	42.5%	56.7%	42.8%
	3 Anthropology	Count	10	7	44	34	95
		% within (15)	10.5%	7.4%	46.3%	35.8%	100.0%
		% within (8)	8.8%	5.4%	41.5%	32.7%	21.0%
Total		Count	113	130	106	104	453
		% within (15)	24.9%	28.7%	23.4%	23.0%	100.0%
		% within (8)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	121.200[a]	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	130.163	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	90.308	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	453		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.81.

The survey of faculty who had had left CIC institutions was too small to divide meaningfully by department, but of the 33 respondents, only 27.3 percent said yes, a book should be required. (The questions were not phrased identically.)

Some researchers perceive that a change in the criteria for promotion and tenure is stymied in part by the attitudes and expectations of tenured faculty: "it is the tenured faculty, above all, who are the fundamental source of intellectual and structural ossification."[11] We do not have evidence to support that assertion. In this study of CIC faculty, tenure status was not statistically related to whether or not individuals thought a book under contract or published should be required for tenure in their department. Neither did the age of the faculty member or the faculty member's tenure status predict whether a book under contract or published should be required for tenure.

It is important to note that that we said "published or under contract." Interviews with chairs indicated that some departments are flexible about a book's being in print at the time of a tenure decision. One historian said, "In the old days [the book] was physically in your hand. Now, because you can't trust publishers—things take more time—[our department] now requires final contract—manuscript in clean shape. [Confirmation that] we will publish your book!"

- *Most faculty members surveyed do not feel a book length manuscript is necessary to present their scholarship.*

The survey of faculty also asked "As you think about the nature of your current research and the best ways to publish it, is a book length manuscript the best way in which to present your work?" Fewer than half (46.8 percent; N=212) stated "Yes, a book length manuscript is needed to develop fully the logic of my argument and ideas." An additional 25.4 percent (N=115) stated they would "prefer to publish as a book; but it would be possible to break down the work into a series of articles." (Table 2)

---

[11] Lohmann, S. (2002). Herding cats, moving cemeteries, and hauling academic trunks: Why change comes hard to the university. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Association of the Study of Higher Education,* Sacramento, California, November 21-24, 2002.

Table 2

As you think about the nature of your current research and the best ways in which to publish it, is a book length manuscript the best way in which to present your work?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes, a book length manuscript is needed to develop...	212	46.5	46.8	46.8
	2 I prefer to publish as a book; but it would be...	115	25.2	25.4	72.2
	3 My scholarship lends itself easily to publication in...	90	19.7	19.9	92.1
	4 My scholarship is best presented in a format other...	3	.7	.7	92.7
	5 Other (please explain)	33	7.2	7.3	100.0
	Total	453	99.3	100.0	
Missing	9 No response	3	.7		
Total		456	100.0		

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	60.020[a]	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	65.453	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	42.718	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	452		

a. 3 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .63.

Not surprising was the disciplinary breakdown of this question: 65.6 percent (N=107) of the historians compared to 38.7 percent (N=75) of English faculty and 30.5 percent (N=29) of anthropologists feel their argument and ideas require a book length manuscript.

- *The publication record of faculty achieving tenure has increased since the 1970s, suggesting that requirements for promotion and tenure in CIC schools have increased.*

Focus groups with junior faculty reveal their beliefs that standards for promotion and tenure have changed in recent years; however, most department chairs interviewed seem to think they have not.

To test whether publishing requirements have changed, we asked all faculty: "Did you have any book-length manuscripts completed and/or in process at the time you were considered for tenure?" We also asked faculty in what year tenure was awarded. An analysis of these responses suggests that tenure requirements at CIC schools *have* increased in the past 30 years. Of faculty tenured since 2000, Almost 90 (89.2 percent; N=58) had one or more completed manuscript at the time they were considered for tenure. Of the faculty tenured prior to 1980, fewer

than two-thirds (64.2%) report having a completed manuscript at the time they were considered for tenure. (Table 3)

As noted above, department chairs generally did not express concern about the current standards, although one commented that the hope was to keep the standards from increasing.

Table 3

"Any book completed when considered for tenure" by TENURE YEAR

| | | | (3) Did you have any book-length manuscripts completed in process at the time you were considered for tenure? | | | | |
			1 Yes, had one complete manuscript at that time	2 Yes, had more than one complete or in process	3 In process of writing at that time	4 No manuscript at that time	Total
(2a) In what year was tenure awarded?	1 2000-2003	Count	40	18	2	5	65
		% within (2a)	61.5%	27.7%	3.1%	7.7%	100.0%
		% within (3)	21.7%	16.5%	5.4%	15.2%	17.9%
	2 1995-1999	Count	35	22	3	8	68
		% within (2a)	51.5%	32.4%	4.4%	11.8%	100.0%
		% within (3)	19.0%	20.2%	8.1%	24.2%	18.7%
	3 1990-1994	Count	29	22	1	3	55
		% within (2a)	52.7%	40.0%	1.8%	5.5%	100.0%
		% within (3)	15.8%	20.2%	2.7%	9.1%	15.2%
	4 1985-1989	Count	24	17	5	3	49
		% within (2a)	49.0%	34.7%	10.2%	6.1%	100.0%
		% within (3)	13.0%	15.6%	13.5%	9.1%	13.5%
	5 1980-1984	Count	20	14	6	5	45
		% within (2a)	44.4%	31.1%	13.3%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within (3)	10.9%	12.8%	16.2%	15.2%	12.4%
	6 1975-1979	Count	24	9	13	5	51
		% within (2a)	47.1%	17.6%	25.5%	9.8%	100.0%
		% within (3)	13.0%	8.3%	35.1%	15.2%	14.0%
	7 1970-1974	Count	10	3	5	3	21
		% within (2a)	47.6%	14.3%	23.8%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within (3)	5.4%	2.8%	13.5%	9.1%	5.8%
	8 Prior to 1970	Count	2	4	2	1	9
		% within (2a)	22.2%	44.4%	22.2%	11.1%	100.0%
		% within (3)	1.1%	3.7%	5.4%	3.0%	2.5%
Total		Count	184	109	37	33	363
		% within (2a)	50.7%	30.0%	10.2%	9.1%	100.0%
		% within (3)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.271[a]	21	.007
Likelihood Ratio	40.154	21	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.375	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	363		

[a]. 11 cells (34.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .82.

- *Nearly one-fourth (24.5%) of the faculty report being asked for a subvention for one or more books. Respondents differ in their perspectives about subventions with some quite accepting of the practice and others concerned about the implications of providing subventions.*

In our survey of all faculty, 24.5 percent (N=98) report they have been asked for a subvention for one or more of their books. Almost 90 percent of the requested subventions were for $1,000 or more and over 10 percent of the requests were for $4,000 or more. Only three faculty members indicated they paid all or part of the subvention from personal funds. 18 (5 percent) said they "negotiated not to pay the subvention." At least one CIC institution provides start-up funds for individuals in the humanistic disciplines. The Office of Research and Development at Penn State provides $10,000 as a start up with the expectation that it should cover subventions for publication should that be necessary.

Requests by scholarly presses for subventions to publish faculty members' monographs trouble individuals we interviewed. One chair feels subventions "could come back to bite her because…someone might say [a book] was published because she [the author] paid for it." Another called subventions "a discouraging system for all participants." Some argue that subventions should not be necessary: universities should go back to funding their presses adequately.

- *Junior faculty have numerous concerns about the process of getting their work in print, including issues of market forces, time between submission and response and the changing profile of presses.*

One of the dynamics of the focus group interviews was the information sharing among the faculty about how to work with publishers. As noted above, they talked about how to work with publishers. This includes how to ask for a response to publishers, the protocols for multiple submissions, and what to do when a book requires many more pictures than the publisher will pay for (publish with a European press was one recommendation).

Faculty members report long lags between submission and review of a manuscript, while often being expected not to do multiple submissions. When asked to identify any difficult experiences they have encountered in seeking to publish their works, half (50 percent; N=228) of the respondents mentioned the length of time required by the publisher to review a manuscript. Other difficulties mentioned by a large number of faculty were "publisher concerned about market for my book" (32.3 percent; N=147); "reviewers did not agree" (29.2 percent; N=133); and publisher concerned about cost of producing book (22.1 percent; N=101)

The market focus of scholarly presses was also mentioned often in comments by chairs and faculty. One eloquent and long comment included the statement:

It has been rather distressing to realize that an informal majority of the major presses in the field—the ones with whom I am expected to publish if I hope to receive tenure—were passing on my project not for its scholarly merits, but because books in the field hadn't been selling. The latter is an important criterion for any business venture, but it's almost completely unrelated to whether or not I am making a substantial contribution to the field…. If we are going to continue to require books for tenure (and I think there are good reasons to do so), we need to uncouple market considerations from evaluation of scholarly merit.

Another person said, "If the criteria employed by university presses are not scholarly, what is the point of requiring a book for tenure?"

Faculty members report the shifting profiles of scholarly publishers--both shifts in areas in which presses publish and types of materials they accept. One noted, "I must stress how difficult it is for first authors to publish in the area of literary studies, now that many university presses have stopped publishing in literary studies entirely, or have drastically cut their lists. Few possibilities exist anymore. Another said, "I'm in a small field, so "backup" or 3rd tier—and arguably even 2nd tier—publishers do not exist. Within this context, the publishers in my field are either cutting their lines completely, reducing them, or moving to only doing textbooks or books with very wide focus." What was prestigious at the time older faculty were tenured may no longer be so; and lesser known presses may have strong lines in certain areas.

- *Faculty members are beginning to examine electronic publications as an outlet for scholarship. A small number of departments have formally considered how electronic publications should be evaluated.*

A substantial part of our survey was devoted to exploring faculty attitudes towards electronic publishing as an alternative to traditional print. We wanted to understand how faculty members think about the problems and advantages with electronic publishing, as well as explore their general attitudes towards electronic publishing by colleagues. Although not an alternative to the book, various forms of electronic publishing expand scholars' opportunities for and methods of presenting their scholarship.

When asked to rank issues that must be resolved before electronic publishing becomes a viable alternative to print, the 3 issues most frequently cited were:

1. Faculty who serve on promotion and tenure and other evaluation committees do not value electronic publications as highly as print publications.
2. Electronic journals in my field are less prestigious than print ones.
3. Other faculty members in my department do not value electronic journals as highly as print publications.

The most significant problems with electronic publishing are issues of prestige confounded with issues of how electronic publications are evaluated by others. Few electronic journals in the humanities and social sciences provide the level of peer review or prestige of editorial boards equivalent to paper-based journals in their fields. And journals do not substitute for the book. One chair said:

There is an e-publication called *Post-Modern Culture* and it was brought to my attention just in May at ACLS forum, edited by a guy at Virginia…it looks perfectly good…it looks perfectly interesting…I don't know… just because it's an e-journal doesn't solve the problem. Does thematic research collection in e form solve the problem...that won't erase the prestige of a book?

In level of importance, copyright issues were ranked seventh out of the ten issues faculty thought needed to be resolved before electronic publication becomes a viable alternative to print. Only 34 individuals (7.6 percent) of the respondents in this study report experiencing copyright problems. One faculty member said, "I have seen JSTOR versions of my work posted without permission on individual web pages." Of the thirty-two comments on copyright issues, (1) five were on issues related to obtaining permission to reproduce copyrighted material; (2) eight were on issues related to others reproducing the material without permission; and (3) eight were related to concerns about increased student plagiarism. This relatively low level of concern about copyright issues may well be an artifact of the sample. Only 62 (13.6 percent) of the faculty surveyed said they had, in fact, published any of their scholarship or creative works in other than traditional paper based form. And we found a clear generational division. Of the tenured faculty, only 10.2 percent (N=37) had published in other formats compared to 28.4 percent (N=25) of the untenured faculty surveyed in this study.

We also asked faculty members to rank some of the advantages of and incentives to use of electronic publishing. Most frequently cited were: (1) wider dissemination; (2) lower publishing delay; and (3) allows multimedia and hyperlinked components. Comments on the advantages of electronic publishing varied from cynicism to enthusiasm. One of the enthusiasts reflected on ways in which electronic publishing has affected his or her publishing activities: "I have started to select paper journals that I know are easily available on-line, because it really makes the work more accessible to colleagues and students. This is a sign, I think, that 'dissemination' is a real advantage of on-line publication"

Among the concerns expressed by our respondents was the cost of electronic publishing. As one faculty member said, "I think the fundamental problem is that electronic publishing is proving to be as expensive as print

publishing (or so I've been told, from more than one source)."[12] Also of concern is the transience of materials in electronic format. "It's also fragile, subject to degradation and loss and liable to be lost to future generations if not updated regularly," said one faculty member.

Our survey inquired into how attitudes towards electronic publishing may have changed in recent years. The survey asked respondents to report if their department has formally considered how electronic publishing should be evaluated. Faculty in both History (16.6 percent; N=27) and English departments (14.4 percent; N=28) are more likely than faculty in Anthropology (3.2 percent; N=3) to report their departments had considered how to evaluate electronic publications; but the numbers are so small that the results are questionable. A large percentage of respondents reported that they didn't know if their department had formally considered how to evaluate electronic publishing, so these percentages do not accurately represent the number faculty working in departments where evaluation of electronic publications has been considered. We can only report numbers of faculty, not numbers of departments. A recent web based study of History department chairs found that only 6% of History departments have a "formal, written policy for assessing technology-related activities in the tenure, promotion, and review process."[13] Our review of promotion and tenure documents in the CIC indicated that Purdue is unusual in addressing the issue with its statement that "Publication may be either in traditional print form or in electronic or on-line forms."

Finally, we asked if faculty members have observed greater respect for alternatives to traditional print by their colleagues. Slightly over one fourth of all faculty (27.2 percent, N=119) responded that they have.

Considerations for CIC Provosts and Deans:

When we look at the responses as a whole, rather than question by question, we find several areas in which members of this summit might begin a conversation.

- To begin we should say that many faculty members seem more concerned about getting articles published than getting their books published—in some areas the ratio of submissions to acceptances is much higher for journals than it is for books. Faculty members are more concerned about the quality of electronic journals than they are about difference in format. Would it be useful for the CIC to assume responsibility for beginning one or more electronic journals that meet standards of peer review, permanence and access?

- Second, as part of their normal mentoring of junior faculty, can department chairs and senior faculty tutor junior faculty more about the processes of identifying publishers and working with them? This would also involve having senior faculty becoming more informed about the changes in profiles of various presses.

- Third, in comments related to electronic publishing it was clear that some faculty in the humanities do not understand the difference between a "born electronic" journal (one originally published in electronic form) and digitized versions of journals made available, for example, through JStor. The first step in expanding conversations about moving beyond print publications must be to help faculty understand what an electronic publication is and what it offers that is different (and what the same) from print publications.

---

[12] Several studies have explored the expenses of electronic publishing, offering different appraisals of its cost-efficiency, and have suggested different models for electronic publishing (Tenopir, Carol and Donald W. King, 2000) (Unsworth, 2003). At the moment, electronic journals in the humanities employ various business models, and we are unable to meaningfully quantify the exact price difference between publishing electronic and print journals. As such, we cannot confirm nor dispute the supposed economic advantages of electronic publishing.

[13] Anderson, Deborah Lines and Dennis A. Trinkle, "'One or Two is not a Problem' or Technology in the Tenure, Promotion, and Review Process." *JAHC,* vol. 4, 1(April, 2001). Available online at: http://mcel.pacificu.edu/JAHC/JAHCIV1/ARTICLES/Anderson-Trinkle/Anderson-Trinkle.html

- Fourth, it is difficult to leave this study without suggesting we examine the economics of scholarly publishing including (1) subventions in relationship to university presses; and (2) the tenuous relationship between market-based decisions for book acceptance and evaluations of scholarship. We were not able to survey directors of university presses for this study, but clearly they should be brought into the discussion.

- Finally, although this study involved only three disciplines, it is obvious that the importance of the scholarly monograph to promotion and tenure is dependent on discipline. This research did not cover several areas like foreign languages and literature where the difficulties of finding an outlet for scholarly monographs are reported to be acute. Are there strategies that CIC institutions might adopt to focus on problems in those critical areas?

References

Anderson, Deborah Lines and Dennis A. Trinkle, "'One or Two is not a Problem' or Technology in the Tenure, Promotion, and Review Process." *JAHC,* vol. 4, 1(April, 2001). Available online at: http://mcel.pacificu.edu/JAHC/JAHCIV1/ARTICLES/Anderson-Trinkle/Anderson-Trinkle.html

Blaise, Cronin and Kathryn La Barre. "Mickey Mouse and Milton: Book Publishing in the Humanities." *Learned Publishing,* vol. 17(January, 2004). Available prior to publication at: http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~klabarre/Humanities.doc

Greenblatt, S. (2002). Call for action on problems in scholarly book publishing; a special letter from Stephen Greenblatt. Available at: http://chronicle.com/jobs/2002/07/2002070202c.htm

Lohmann, S. (2002). "Herding cats, moving cemeteries, and hauling academic trunks: Why change comes hard to the university." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of the Study of Higher Education, Sacramento, California, November 21-24, 2002.

Ryan, Judith, et al. "The Future of Scholarly Publishing," *Profession 2002.* New York: MLA, 2002. 172-186. Available at http://www.mla.org

Tenopir, Carol and Donald W. King. (2000). "Towards Electronic Journals: Realities for Scientists, Librarians, and Publishers." Psycoloquy, 11:84

Unsworth, John, "The Crisis in Scholarly Publishing in the Humanities." *ARL,* no. 228 (June 2003): 1-4. Available online at: http://www.arl.org/newsltr/228/crisis.html

Waters, Lindsay. "Rescue Tenure From the Tyranny of the Monograph," The Chronicle of Higher Education. April 20, 2001: B7. Available online at: http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v47/i32/32b00701.htm

The Book as the Gold Standard for Tenure and Promotion in the Humanistic Disciplines

Methodological Notes

Leigh Estabrook, Professor of Library and Information Science and of Sociology and Director
Library Research Center
with Bijan Warner, Research Assistant
University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana

The study was designed to include all members of the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, 13 universities.[14] It was funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation at the end of May, 2003 with a deadline of November 30, 2003 for a report to the Foundation. In order to provide a report to Summit participants by mid-November, researchers completed all data collection and analysis by November 15.

Data for this study came from telephone interviews, questionnaires administered on the web with postal mail follow-up, and focus groups. The following report provides information about (1) the way in which all phases of data collection were managed, (2) response rates and (3) difficulties we encountered in the process. Initially, we intended to include six to eight humanistic disciplines in the study; but ultimately chose three--English, history and anthropology--to facilitate collecting contact information and to allow analysis by discipline. Only in the focus groups of non-tenured faculty did we expand the pool.

On May 27, 2003, CIC Director Barbara Allen sent a letter to Arts and Sciences Deans requesting (1) contact information for current tenure and tenure-track faculty; (2) names and contact information for any tenure track faculty who, in the past five years, had left the university prior to receiving tenure; (3) promotion and tenure guidelines from the department, college and campus levels. We received complete information from six of the CIC institutions. One other provided all but campus and department level promotion and tenure guidelines. Three others failed to submit contact information from all the departments. The University of Chicago formally declined to participate and Northwestern University never responded. We are aware that the information we requested from institutions is sensitive data. One university received a threat of a law suit from a faculty member who had left. She demanded that the university change her designation from "not being awarded tenure" to "left voluntarily." We had, in fact, not requested information about why they had left.[15]

I.   Focus groups with junior non-tenured faculty

Leigh Estabrook moderated three focus groups of junior faculty: The first at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (June 11), the second at Northwestern University (June 25) and the third at the University of Iowa (June 26). Anita Michael, a staff member in the Library Research Center who is experienced in recruiting focus group participants, developed the list of untenured faculty from university websites. She introduced the project in an initial email and followed that up with a telephone call asking individuals if they would be willing to participate in a 90 to 120 minute focus group. Each prospective participant was informed of the purpose of the study and told they would receive an honorarium of $35

---

[14] Illinois-Chicago, Indiana University, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Penn State University, Purdue University, University of Chicago, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Wisconsin,
[15] See Appendix 1 for text of letter

for participation. (We considered raising the monetary incentive, but it was clear the problem in getting a sufficient number of participants was availability, not incentive to participate.)

Holding the focus groups in the summer presented a significant problem in recruitment. Many untenured faculty were not on campus. It was essential to hold the groups early in the grant period because those discussions were intended to inform the questions asked in the survey to all faculty. We extended recruitment to departments such as philosophy, languages and art history to try to get a sufficient pool. Ultimately there were four participants at Illinois, five at Northwestern, and 9 at Iowa. A copy of the focus group guide is Appendix 2.

Weihong Peng, a doctoral student, sat in on the sessions, tape recorded them, and took supplementary notes. The Illinois session was also attended by an interested master's student who also took notes. Those notes of the Illinois session form the basis for our analysis, since the recorder failed. Based on that experience, the Library Research Center purchased a high quality digital tape recorder for the second and third groups. A research assistant transcribed those for analysis.

II.   *Telephone interviews with department chairs and heads*

Between August 25 and September 11, 2003, Leigh Estabrook interviewed 17 department chair from 6 CIC institutions: Michigan State, University of Michigan, Penn State, Indiana University, University of Minnesota and Illinois-Chicago. Bijan Warner, research assistant, identified names, addresses, telephone numbers and email addresses from university web-sites. He then called each department to confirm that the chair named on the web site was the chair for the 2003-2004 academic year. Based on the corrected information Estabrook sent a letter (Appendix 3) on to each department chair on August 15 saying she would call to set up an appointment on August 25. She then called each of the departments to schedule a 1/2 hour telephone interview with the chair. During the interview, she transcribed almost verbatim those conversations and used, as an interview guide, the recommendations from the MLA outlined in the letter to the heads.

Of the 18 chair contacted, only one was not interviewed and that was because of a scheduling conflict. He was out of town during the time Estabrook was conducting the interviews and she was leaving for China as he returned. All were eager to participate and forthcoming in the interviews.

III.   *Web-based surveys*

Because of our concern about the short time frame for the study, Library Research Center staff decided to expedite purchase of a commercial software package as a primary means of administering surveys to faculty. Our experience in recruiting focus group participants suggested we would not be able to reach faculty until September and it would be difficult to do one paper mailing with two paper mail follow-ups in time to analyze the data for the Summit.

For this study the LRC deployed two web based surveys to faculty in history, anthropology and English:

- To faculty reported as having been untenured assistant professors at a CIC institution who had left that institution within the past five years

- To all current faculty at CIC institutions which had supplied contact data to us.

Survey to faculty who had left

CIC university administrators provided contact information of 72 faculty who had left their universities in the past five years. Using that contact information, Bijan Warner was able to identify 53 valid email addresses (10 had no email, 9 had invalid email addresses). The survey was initially deployed on September 18-22, 2003, with a first reminder sent September 25 and 26; a second on September 29 and a third on October 7. The LRC received 33 responses for a response rate of 62 percent. Given the limited time of the study, and the high response rate from email, we chose not to conduct a postal mail follow-up.

Although we do not know the population of those who left, it is apparent from comments to the questionnaire and email addresses that indicate academic affiliation that we have responses from a mix of individuals who left voluntarily and those who did not achieve tenure. The questionnaire (Appendix 5) focuses on the experiences of those faculty members in trying to publish their scholarship and explicitly states it is not a questionnaire about tenure and promotion.

Survey to all faculty

CIC university administrators provided information for 876 tenured and tenure-track faculty in the three disciplines. The LRC did not receive contact information from the University of Chicago, which declined to participate in the study, as well as information about faculty from:
- Indiana University's English and Anthropology Departments
- All faculty from Northwestern
- All faculty from University of Michigan
- All faculty from University of Wisconsin

All other departments submitted a list of contact information, which comprised the subject pool of the survey to current faculty.

The LRC sent out email invitations for an online survey on October 9th followed by a reminder email on October 14th. Of the 864 invited, 363 submitted the online survey for a response rate of 42 percent. In addition to the online survey, a paper mailing was sent to all respondents who had not yet responded on October 24th. Of the 666 paper surveys sent out, 93 were returned for a response rate of 14 percent of the paper surveys or 11 percent of all surveys. The total response rate for all paper and online surveys is 52.7 percent (N=456). (See Appendix 6 for questionnaire.)

One difficulty we encountered in the survey to all faculty arose from misinterpretations of question 2b: "What is the number of refereed articles in paper-based journals you had published or were in press at the time you were considered for tenure." Although the question specifically requests the number of refereed articles, many respondents included unusually large numbers. A check of some of these respondents' curricula vitas revealed that a significant number of respondents included all published articles, even those in popular magazines and non-refereed journals. Consequently, the number of articles reported by these respondents was so high as to significantly skew any analysis (i.e., 30-100 articles). As a result, we were unable to do an analysis of the average number of articles published in relation to year

tenure was achieved. Our attempt to quantify increasing pressure for tenure-track faculty to publish was thus limited to an analysis of the number of books published in relation to year tenure was achieved.

One way to reduce misreporting of published refereed articles might have been to emphasize in some other way in the survey (with bold text, etc.) that we are only requesting refereed articles. A more reliable, albeit difficult solution would be to request participant c.v.'s and code all journal articles. We chose not to do this not only because of the limited time-frame for the study, but also because a vita does not give information about when an article might have been submitted and accepted for publication. Given delays of up to two years from that point to time of publication, it would be easy to underestimate a faculty members "in press" articles at the time she or he was considered for tenure.

IV.   Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The LRC requested Promotion and Tenure Guideline documents at the departmental, college, and university level from CIC university administrators. We received documents from all of the participating universities except Northwestern and the University of Wisconsin. Of the universities that did send P&T documents, several were missing some of the documents, either at the department, college, or campus level. While some of the departments do not have individual guidelines, adhering instead to either the campus or college level guidelines, we do not know the precise number of these. We received P&T documents for the following:

- Indiana University returned English department, as well as college and campus guidelines.
- Michigan State returned all departmental, college and campus guidelines.
- Ohio State returned all departmental, college and campus guidelines.
- Penn State returned the college guidelines.
- Purdue University returned English and History department, as well as college and campus guidelines. The Anthropology department is currently in the process of creating department specific guidelines.
- University of Illinois at Chicago returned all departmental, college and campus guidelines.
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign returned all department guidelines.
- University of Iowa returned all departmental, college and campus guidelines.
- University of Michigan returned the English department as well as college and campus guidelines.
- University of Minnesota returned all department and college guidelines.

We did not do a quantitative analysis of the promotion and tenure guidelines (i.e., what is the number of departments that explicitly require a book?) as others have studied this (Cronin and La Barre). We instead examined the submitted promotion and tenure guidelines to reveal general attitudes towards book publishing as well as how the written guidelines coincide with what chairs reported to us that P&T committees actually expect from tenure-track faculty. Based on interviews with department chairs, we suggest that these guidelines are not particularly good evidence on which to evaluate the behavior of departments' decision making regarding tenure and promotion.

V.   How has the number of books published varied in relation to the number of faculty in each field?

The purpose of this analysis was to find evidence that would substantiate or disprove claims that the climate in research publishing has become more difficult as the number of faculty has increased dramatically while the total number of books published has only experienced moderate growth. We encountered several difficulties in collecting and classifying the necessary information to answer this question. We have determined that this question requires a broad and thorough analysis; an incomplete and anecdotal analysis limited to CIC institutions would be possibly misleading. Although included in the proposal, we have determined that we are not able to give a meaningful answer using the proposed method.

The analysis requires collecting data on the number of books published in each field by year. Although information on university press output is public and readily available, it is only available by Dewey or LC classification. Our proposal indicated that we would strive to use categories of press output "in ways that are meaningfully mapped to these fields [English, History, and Anthropology]." Yet this task involves subjective judgments, such as how to classify interdisciplinary monographs, as well as

monographs in fields such as Asian Studies or the Sociology of Literature. The results of this analysis would therefore be imperfect and possibly skewed.

Although we were unsuccessful in gathering the required data for this analysis, we have explored possible methods to do so. One approach to obtaining information on book publishing would be to consult with Yankee Book Peddler, which collects information on press output and offers the ability to create customized reports for specific parameters and periods of time. We have obtained a list of publisher output by Dewey classification, but it would require collaboration with YBP to obtain information on press output mapped to the three fields over a course of many years.

Another difficulty encountered was in gathering information on the number of faculty in each department, by year. The faculty rosters provided by the participating CIC institutions sometimes included ineligible faculty. In retrospect we realize we might have worked with each institution's division of institutional research to obtain numbers of faculty over time. We did not identify a reliable way to determine how many faculty were in each department in each year, for the past 20 years. Furthermore, for this analysis to represent the competition in finding a publisher, it would require collecting information on the number of faculty in each field in all universities-not just the CIC institutions.

Appendix 1
Letter to Arts and Sciences Deans Requesting Contact Information

Dated: May 27, 2003

I am pleased to inform you that the CIC Chief Academic Officers responded with enthusiasm to the CIC LAS Deans' proposal for a summit on scholarly communication, and the Mellon Foundation has agreed to support a modest research project in preparation for this meeting. For your information, I have attached a brief description of the proposed summit, as well as the plan for the related research project.

The summit and the research will focus on a key issue identified in the MLA report: the book as "gold standard" in promotion & tenure decisions in the humanities and social sciences. We believe this will provide an opportunity to consider changes (if necessary) in current guidelines, and will provide a springboard to additional research and subsequent action regarding new venues for scholarly publishing.

We will survey your office soon regarding the best dates for the summit. In the meantime, in order to initiate the research, we need your assistance:

(1) The study will include all departments of English, History and Anthropology within CIC universities and include tenured and tenure track faculty at all ranks and individuals who—in the past five years—have not received tenure or have chosen to leave your university prior to receiving tenure. We will need contact information for these individuals, including home and email addresses since the questionnaires to them will be sent over the summer. In the case of individuals who have left your university, please include whatever information you have that may help the research staff in finding them.

(2) The study will also examine the criteria for promotion and tenure at the department, college and university level. Could you please provide the written policies for each of the departments, for your college and for the university?

(3) The study will question department chairs/heads about issues related to promotion and tenure in the humanistic disciplines. If you could identify department executive officers in these disciplines, that would also be helpful.

Professor Leigh S. Estabrook, professor of library and information science and of sociology at UIUC will direct the research. The requested information should be sent to her at 501 East Daniel, Champaign, IL 61820. She is most willing to answer any questions you may have about the research project.

In order to have the research complete in time for the summit this fall, Professor Estabrook is beginning work now. Thus, I ask that you send the requested information to her by June 20th at the latest.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this important research. I very much look forward to sharing the results with you and to working with you to craft the agenda for the summit.

Sincerely,

Barbara McFadden Allen, Director

Appendix 2
Discussion guide for focus groups

Introduction--MLA paper; Provost and LAS dean concerns →Mellon grant for research in preparation for summit

1. Book publishing (45 minutes)

    a. Have you sought to publish your research as a monograph? If so, what has been your experience working with potential publishers?

    b. How important do you think it is to have a book published (or under contract) in order to be tenured in your department at this university?

    c. Do you perceive that standards for promotion and tenure are higher for scholars today than they were a generation (20 years) ago?

2. Electronic publishing (45 minutes)

    a. To what extent are electronic publications viewed as a "credential" by your senior colleagues?

    b. Do you think that the evaluation process and criteria for P&T in your department is positive, negative or neutral to electronic publications? What about the University?

    c. And how do these views affect your practice in placing your research in electronic publications?

    d. Should there be any change in the P&T policy, would you adjust your attitude and publishing behavior accordingly? For example, would you consider publishing more of your work in journal, rather than monographic form?

    e. **Intellectual Property issues--**Do you have any intellectual property concerns regarding electronic publishing either as an author or reader?

    f. **Technology issues-**-Do you think that you have sufficient equipment and technology literacy for preparing electronic publications and evaluating where to place them?

    g. **General attitude-**- what is your evaluation of the quality of electronic publications in your particular area of research? Do electronic publications exist that you respect? If the same peer-review process is applied to electronic publications, what do you think about the quality of the publications?

3. Finally, I'd like to ask you a few general questions about your use of electronic materials in your academic work. (30 minutes)

   a. For what purposes do you and your colleagues use the Internet? (e.g. searching online databases; looking up papers of potential interest; reading online journals; putting your own papers online; "conversing" on listservs or through e-mail; or communicating with colleagues.)

   b. What are the primary ways you find out about the work of your colleagues? What methods do you prefer for obtaining copies of their research articles?

   c. What electronic means have you used to disseminate your work? If any of your works have been disseminated electronically, (preliminary draft or formal publication) do you think that your colleagues value them equally as their print counterparts?

   d. To what extent do you read or cite electronic publications for **teaching** and for **research** respectively? Is there any significant difference between your choice in the two kinds of activities? Can you explain?

   e. Do you **collaborate** with your colleagues in doing research? If so, do you use electronic means to facilitate it? What do you think electronic publishing has to do with collaboration?

Remember to thank them, have them sign the form acknowledging receipt of the honorarium and then give them envelope with money

Appendix 3
Letter to Department Heads

Dear :

Under a grant from the Mellon Foundation to the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, I am conducting a study of the book as the "gold standard" for promotion and tenure in the humanities. Findings will inform a summit of CIC provosts and arts and sciences deans to be held late this fall.

As part of this research I would like to talk to you about recommendations to departments made by authors of a recent Modern Language Association report entitled *The Future of Scholarly Publishing* [available online at http://www.mla.org]. The report called on departments to:

- *Alter expectations with regard to all levels of publishing.*
- *Work vigorously against the tendency toward increasing expectations with regard to quantity of publications in tenure and promotion decisions.*
- *Develop a broader understanding of what is important for their field and the contribution they make to the educational mission of their institution. Articulate their position with regard to specific categories of scholarly publications, including editions and translations in addition to more traditional specialized monographs.*
- *Recognize that this is a period of transition with regard to electronic publication and web archives. Work with appropriate committees and administrators to develop guidelines about how these will be evaluated.*
- *Recognize that subventions are an increasingly common factor in scholarly publishing and support their faculty accordingly.*
- *Have university administrations make their new guidelines clear to outside evaluators.*

Do you think these recommendations are realistic? Have you implemented any of them in your department? Have you modified criteria for promotion and tenure in the past 5 to 10 years? Are you likely to make modifications in the foreseeable future? If so, in what ways?

I would like to conduct a brief interview to discuss your thinking on the MLA recommendations. Because of the short time frame for the grant, we hope to complete this interview before September 12th, scheduled at your convenience. The interview should take about 30 minutes. I will call your office on Monday, August 25th to schedule a time for this phone interview. Thank you in advance for considering this request. I look forward to hearing your responses.

Sincerely yours,

Leigh Estabrook, Professor and
Director of the Library Research Center

Appendix 4
Faculty Who Left – Cover Letter and Survey (2 pages)

Cover letter to Faculty who Left

Dear former [insert name of CIC school] faculty member

Recently senior administrators from CIC institutions (the "Big 10" plus University of Chicago) proposed a "CIC Summit on Scholarly Communication in the Humanities and Social Sciences." This summit will address several issues and recommendations from the Modern Language Association report "The Future of Scholarly Publishing." Among these is the statement:

"From both an intellectual and an economic perspective, scholarship in all language and literature fields would be better served if the book were not so universally required for the award of tenure and promotion…. By ceasing to regard book publication as the gold standard for tenure and promotion, universities and colleges would be able to place more emphasis on the quality of the publications rather than on their external format."

Participants in the meeting (the Chief Academic Officers & Deans of Arts and Sciences of the CIC universities) have said they will identify and commit to action steps that will alleviate pressures on the scholarly communication system in the humanities and social science fields where the book is the typical unit of publication.

I am sending this questionnaire to faculty in history, anthropology and English who have left tenure-track positions in CIC institutions during the past five years. I hope to understand better your experiences in publishing--and trying to publish--both journal articles and monographs. I have also included a few questions about alternative publishing venues. This study will inform a summit of CIC deans of arts and sciences and provosts to be held on December 2, 2003.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to respond to this questionnaire. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss it. I will be happy to send you a copy of the final report if you would like.

Sincerely yours,

Leigh S. Estabrook
Professor of Library and Information Science
Professor of Sociology and
Director of the Library Research Center

A summary of frequencies for this questionnaire may be found at
http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/99EZJ2/99EZJ2_0001.html

A summary of open ended comments may be found at
http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/2V7GP4/2V7GP4_0001.html

Appendix 5
Questionnaire to Faculty Who Left

[*note, these are the questions, but not the layout--the questionnaire was only formatted as a web survey*]

1.   In what years did you work for this institution?
2.   Did you have one or more book length manuscripts in process and/or complete at the time you left that institution?

        Yes, complete manuscript at that time
        In process of writing at that time
        No manuscript at that time
        Had more than one complete or in process

If you had more than one book published or in process, please answer the following questions for the oldest title (by publication date or time you began writing). You will be taken to a second set of questions if you indicated you had more than one in process or complete.

(3a) At the time you changed positions from the CIC University was the book length manuscript...

        Published
        Under contract
        In process of completion but not yet being considered by a press
        In Press
        Under review by one or more presses

(3b) What type of book?

        Monograph
        Edited Collection
        Textbook
        Critical edition
        Other (please describe)

(3c) Do you have any comments about your experience with publishers and/or reviewers in trying to publish this manuscript?

Questions repeated for second book length manuscript

(4) What is the number of refereed articles in paper-based journals you had published or were in press at the time you changed positions?
        None
        One
        Two
        Three
        Four
        Five

Other

(5) Did issues in finding an outlet for your scholarship (e.g., obtaining a contract for a book, time taken to review manuscript or article) play any role in your move to a different position?

No
Yes

(5a) Please identify those issues in publishing your work(s) that you encountered? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.)

Length of time required by publisher to review my manuscript
Publisher required a subvention
Reviewers did not agree
Publisher concerned about market for my book
Publisher concerned about cost of producing book
Publisher set limits on pictures, diagrams, text, and/or other content
Publisher ceased publication in my particular area
Other

(5b.) Please explain

(6) Is there anything else you would like to say about the problem of scholarly publishing, criteria for promotion and tenure, and issues for junior faculty?

(7) Did issues in scholarly publishing play any role in you decision to leave that university?

(8.) In searching for an appropriate place to publish your work, you may have encountered new opportunites for alternative publishing through emerging technologies or new uses of existing technologies. If you have employed media other than traditional print, we would like to find out more about your decision to do so.

(9.) Have you published results of your research or created other types of work in any media other than print?

No Yes

(9a.) Please tell us some more information (title, publication, URL) about works you have published in media other than print: [OPEN RESPONSE]

 (9b.) Why did you choose to publish these works in media other than print? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

higher visibility
wider impact
appropriate to my kind of research and creative work
ability to voice "unorthodox" opinions
to support and lend credibility to alternative publishers/forms of publishing
less delay in publishing process
good place to communicate preliminary research and findings before refining into a polished work
provided way to incorporate various media
Other

Appendix 6
Current Faculty – Cover Letter and Survey (6 pages)
This was a web-based survey adapted to paper. Tenured and Untenured faculty received separate subsets of questions that, in the paper survey, were administered on sheets of different colors.

Cover Letter to Current Faculty

Dear CIC University Faculty Member:

This letter is a follow-up to an email request sent to you on October 9th and 14th. We hope you are willing to complete the attached survey related to the future of scholarly publishing. Your answers will help academic administrators better understand faculty experiences in publishing—and trying to publish—both journal articles and monographs. The survey will also provide information about ways in which faculty in the humanistic disciplines regard alternative publishing venues. The Mellon Foundation had funded this study to inform a summit of CIC arts and sciences deans and provosts to be held on December 2, 2003.

We are sending this paper questionnaire to those who requested it, those who have not yet responded to the survey, and those who had technical difficulties with the online survey. Thank you in advance for taking the time to respond to this questionnaire. To meet our deadline, it would be helpful to have your responses by November 10th. I will be happy to send you a copy of the final report if you would like.

Sincerely yours,

Leigh S. Estabrook
Professor of Library and Information Science
Professor of Sociology
Director of the Library Research Center

A summary of frequencies may be found at http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/V5H3JW/V5H3JW_0001.html

A summary of comments to open ended questions may be found at
http://lrcsurvey.lis.uiuc.edu/surveys/33E9AU/33E9AU_0001.html

Survey to Current Faculty (6 pages)

1. Please indicate your current professorial rank:

> Assistant Professor... 1
> Associate Professor 2
> Professor.. 3
> Other (please explain) 4
>
> _____

> 1a. Have you been awarded tenure?
>
>> No.............................. 1
>> Yes 2

If you have been awarded tenure, please complete the additional questions on the green insert. If you have not been awarded tenure, please complete the purple insert.

6. As you think about the nature of your current research and the best ways in which to publish it, is a book length manuscript the best way in which to present your work? (please choose one)

> Yes, a book length manuscript is needed to develop fully the logic of my argument and ideas 1
>
> I prefer to publish as a book; but it would be possible to break down the work into a series of articles... 2
>
> My scholarship lends itself easily to publication in formats shorter than a book-length manuscript... 3
>
> My scholarship is best presented in a format other than print on paper, such as film or a "hyper-linked" documents 4
>
> Other (please explain) _____ 5
>
> _____

7. Please identify any difficult experiences that you have encountered in seeking to publish your work(s): (check all that apply)
   - G Length of time required by publisher to review my manuscript
   - G Publisher required a subvention
   - G Reviewers did not agree
   - G Publisher concerned about market for my book
   - G Publisher concerned about cost of producing book
   - G Publisher set limits on pictures, diagrams, text, and/or other content
   - G Publisher ceased publication in my particular area
   - G I had no difficult experiences
   - G Other (please explain) _____

   7a. Please elaborate on any difficulties you may have encountered in seeking to publish your works:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you believe that a book (under contract or published) should be required for tenure in your department?

Yes 1
Yes, with rare exceptions 2
Not for certain subfields 3
No 4

Some individuals have suggested that new forms of electronic communications may provide a solution to the current crisis in scholarly publication. The following brief section asks about your use of alternatives to print communication and how you evaluate these alternatives in academic practice.

9. The following 10 issues represent problems that many faculty say must be resolved before electronic publication becomes a viable alternative to print. Please rank the following issues from 1-10 (1=the most important issue to resolve; 10=the least important).

[You must answer each item with a unique number. Our test respondents have found it helpful to begin by ranking the MOST(1) important issue, then moving up to the LEAST(10) important issue]

___ Electronic publications lack permanent archives
___ There are no electronic journals that specifically cover my topic
___ Faculty who serve on promotion and tenure and other evaluation committees do not value electronic publications as highly as print publications
___ Other faculty members in my department do not value electronic journals as highly as print publications
___ Electronic journals in my field are less prestigious than print ones
___ Electronic publishing requires more time in preparing for submission
___ Electronic publishing requires technical abilities that I don't have
___ Electronic publishing is more vulnerable to plagiarism and violation of copyright
___ Electronic publications do not have the same level of peer review as print
___ The editorial boards of electronic publications are not as prestigious

9a. Is there anything else you want to say about problems in electronic publishing's becoming a viable alternative to print for scholarly communication?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

10. Compared to print publications, what are the advantages and incentives to publishing electronically- again in rank order (1=most important/strongest argument for publishing research electronically; 7=least/weakest reason).

___ Wider dissemination
___ Lower publishing delay
___ Lower submission costs
___ Quicker response from reviewers
___ More opportunity to publish
___ Allows multimedia and hyperlinked components
___ Electronic publications are less dependent on the market

10a. Is there anything else you want to say about advantages and/or incentives to electronic publication?

_____
_____
_____
_____

11a. Has your department formally considered how electronic publications should be evaluated?

No 1
Yes 2
Don't know 3

11b. In the past 3 years have you observed a greater respect on the part of members of your department for scholarship presented in alternatives to print media?

No 1
Yes 2

12. Either as an author or reader, have you experienced any copyright problems with electronic publications?

No 1
Yes (please describe briefly) 2

_____
_____
_____

Finally, would you please answer a few questions about yourself:

13. Your gender:

        Female 1

        Male.. 2

14. Your age:

        under 30... 1

        30-39 2

        40-49 3

        50-59 4

        60-69 5

        70 or over 6

15. Your department:

        History... 1

        English 2

        Anthropology 3

16. Your major research areas:

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

17. If there is anything you would like to add about scholarly publishing in the humanistic disciplines and/or your experiences in publishing your work, we would welcome your comments:

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

If you have more to say on issues of scholarly publishing or promotion and tenure, or if you would like to expand upon any of the above comment spaces, please include them on a separate sheet of paper.

Please answer the following questions if you have received tenure

2a. In what year was tenure awarded?

2000-2003 1	1980-1984 5
1995-1999 2	1975-1979 6
1990-1994 3	1970-1974 7
1985-1989 4	Prior to 1970 ..8

Think back to the time you were initially awarded tenure--at whatever institution that was--and please answer the following questions. We are interested in the portfolio that went forward to the highest college or university committee that reviewed you for tenure.

2b. What is the number of refereed articles in paper-based journals you had published or were in press at the time you were considered for tenure?

None 0	Four 4
One 1	Five 5
Two 2	Other: ____
Three 3	

2c. At the time you were awarded tenure, had you published any of your scholarship or created any scholarly works in a format other than traditional paper-based print?

No **(If NO, skip to Q3)**...1
Yes 2

2d. Please describe the non-print publications/creations you had published at the time you were considered for tenure:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

3. Did you have any book-length manuscripts completed and/or in process at the time you were considered for tenure?

Yes, had one complete manuscript at that time 1
Yes, had more than one complete or in process................................2
In process of writing at that time **(please skip to question 4)** 3
No manuscript at that time **(please skip to question 4)**....................4

If you had more than one book published or in process, please answer the following questions for the oldest title (by publication date or time you began writing). You will be taken to a second set of questions if you indicated you had more than one in process or complete.

3a. At the time you were considered for tenure by the college or university's highest level committee, was the book length manuscript...

        Published..1
        In Press...2
        Under contract...3
        Under review by one or more presses..4
        In process of completion but not yet under consideration by a press 5

Please answer the following questions if you have received tenure

3b. What type of book?

        Monograph...1
        Edited Collection 2
        Textbook 3
        Critical Edition..4
        Other (please describe) 5

        _____

3c. At the time you were considered for tenure, was your second book length manuscript…

        Published..1
        In Press...2
        Under contract...3
        Under review by one or more presses..4
        In process of completion but not yet under consideration by a press 5

3d. What type of book is it?

        Monograph...1
        Edited Collection 2
        Textbook 3
        Critical Edition..4
        Other (please describe) 5

        _____

4. How many book length projects have you completed during your academic career?

        None..0
        One..1
        Two 2
        Three 3
        Four..4
        Five 5
        More than 5 6

5. During your scholarly career, has a publisher ever requested a subvention for publishing one or more of your books?

No...1
Yes, for one book...2
Yes, for more than one book..3

If you have been asked for more than one subvention, please answer the following questions in regard to the most recent book for which a subvention was requested.

5a. How much was the requested subvention?

Less than $500 ....1 $2000-2999 5
$500-749 ....2 $3000-3999 6
$750-999 ....3 $4000-4999 7
$1000-1999 ....4 $5000 or more............8

5b. Who paid the subvention? (check all that apply)

G I did from my personal funds   G Funds from the university
G A grant from an organization   G Funds from my department or college
outside the university   G I negotiated not to pay the subvention

Please resume the main (white) survey.

Please answer the following questions if you have not yet received tenure

2a. In what year did you receive your Ph.D.?

1997...............1	2001.....................5	Other (please
1998...............2	2002.....................6	indicate) _____
1999...............3	2003.....................7	
2000...............4	Not yet awarded ...8	

2b. What is the number of refereed articles in paper-based journals you have published or are in press at this time?

None..............0	Three 3	Other _____
One................1	Four...............4	
Two 2	Five 5	

3. Have you published any of your scholarship or created any scholarly works in a format other than traditional paper-based print?

No......................1   Yes 2

(If NO, skip to Q4)

3a. Please describe those non-print publications/creations:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

4. Do you have any book-length manuscripts completed and/or in process at this time?

Yes have one complete manuscript...1
Yes, have more than one complete manuscript 2
In process of writing 3
(Skip to Q6, on main survey page)
No manuscript at this time 4
(Skip to Q6, on main survey page)

If you had more than one book published or in process, please answer the following questions for the oldest title (by publication date or time you began writing). You will be taken to a second set of questions if you indicated you had more than one in process or complete.

4a. What type is your first book?

Monograph.................1	Critical edition 4
Edited collection 2	Other (please describe)
Textbook 3	_____

4b. Is this book under contract with a publisher?

No.........................1   Yes 2

4c. What is the name of the publisher of your first book?
_____

4d. Did the publisher request a subvention?
        No.........................1   Yes 2

4e. How much was the requested subvention?
        Less than $500 ....1 $2000-2999 5
        $500-749 ....2 $3000-3999 6
        $750-999 ....3 $4000-4999 7
        $1000-1999 ....4 $5000 or more 8

Please answer the following questions if you have not yet received tenure

4f. Who paid the subvention? (check all that apply)
G I did from my personal funds   G Funds from my department or
G A grant from an organization   college
outside the university   G I negotiated not to pay the
G Funds from the university   subvention

5a. If you have more than one book complete or in process, what type is your second book?
        Monograph.................1   Critical edition 4
        Edited collection 2   Other (please describe)
        Textbook 3
                               _____

5b. Is this book under contract with a publisher?
        No.........................1   Yes 2

5c. What is the name of the publisher of your first book?
_____

5d. Did the publisher request a subvention?
        No.........................1   Yes 2

5e. How much was the requested subvention?
        Less than $500 ....1 $2000-2999 5
         $500-749 ....2 $3000-3999 6
        $750-999 ....3 $4000-4999 7
        $1000-1999 ....4 $5000 or more 8

5f. Who paid the subvention? (check all that apply)

G I did from my personal funds
G A grant from an organization outside the university

G Funds from the university
G Funds from my department or college
G I negotiated not to pay the subvention

Please resume the main (white) survey.